

next generation rise up and not call us blessed, they will curse our names.

I am here because I have hope. We are going to turn things around. We have just got to keep fighting. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REGULAR ORDER IN THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

We are constantly confronted with agendas and issues, some of which are good for the country, and some of which are bad for the country. That is why we debate here in this Congress.

I would like to think that anything that passes off the floor of the House of Representatives enjoys the full support of at least a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives. I would like to think that is also the case with the Senate. I would like to think that when we disagree, we come together in conference and we produce a conference report that can achieve and enjoy the majority support of the House and the Senate of the conference report and go on its way to the President's desk, where it is either signed into law or vetoed and sent back to the Chamber of origin, as the Constitution directs.

There are also tactics and maneuvers that go on in this Congress, and this more than two centuries of the structure of this great deliberative body has developed a system within our committee process to define jurisdiction committee by committee. More committees have been created over the years, some committees have been abolished over the years, but it is designed to function so that this constitutional Republic—which is guaranteed in our Constitution, by the way—brings the best judgment of the people in America through their elected representatives.

There are 435 House districts and 100 Senators from the 50 States. The good ideas that come from our neighborhoods need to go into the eyes and ears of their Member of Congress, and we need to bring it here and bring those best ideas forward and compete. Put those ideas together in a competitive fashion so that as we sit down and first we draft a bill, that bill gets assigned to the committee of jurisdiction where the people have accumulated expertise on the topic are seated. There will be hearings for them to get better informed about the bill in question itself, and then in the subcommittee, a mark-up of the base bill that allows every member of the subcommittee to offer

an amendment, any series of amendments, that are germane to the topic and the subject of the bill, which is assigned to the committee because of the jurisdiction of the committee, and then that subcommittee acts, in which case then the bill goes to the full committee for a similar process to the broader committee.

If it comes out of that committee improved in theory—and actually improved in practice most of the time—then that bill goes on the calendar here on the floor, where in which case it is subjected to the amendments that might come from all of the other Members, the Members that are on the committee of jurisdiction and the Members who are not on the committee of jurisdiction.

When this Congress is set up to function accurately, when we are defending, protecting, and respecting the jurisdiction of the various committees, we get the best product because we have the people on the committees that have—at least in theory—the most knowledge about the topic that comes before the committee. Some have years and years of expertise accumulated, some not quite as long, but they might bring that interest from their private life into the committee, as well.

I get very concerned when I see a bill come to the floor that didn't go through the committee process, that didn't have a legitimate hearing process, that didn't go through subcommittee or the full committee and comes to this floor because someone decided that it was so urgent that we act on a subject that we didn't have time to go through regular order.

□ 1600

That concerns me a lot. I get concerned when there is an expectation that we will have a full debate here on the floor on a bill, and it is brought to the floor and voice-voted on a weekend, going into a weekend, without the knowledge of most of the Members of Congress. I get concerned about regular order.

I have had my conversations with our leadership regarding that. I am not yet satisfied that this is the last time. However, Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor to address a different kind of regular order, a kind of regular order that is this: if we have committees that are not committees of jurisdiction of a subject or a topic and that subject or topic outside their jurisdiction is slipped into a must-pass piece of legislation from another committee, now they have usurped the jurisdiction of the committee that actually has that jurisdiction, and they have placed a topic into a subject matter that must pass, and the people who have allowed that to happen on their watch, at least in theory, don't possess the expertise that exists within the committee of jurisdiction.

Now, all of this gibberish that I am talking about now, this technical ex-

planation of what goes on here in this Congress boils down to this, Mr. Speaker—and I want to speak specifically to this issue. There is a bill that is floating around this Congress that is referred to as the ENLIST Act.

I can't read for you the name of this bill because it is about as accurate as the Affordable Care Act is to naming ObamaCare; but it is one that grants amnesty to people who come into the United States—are unlawfully present in the United States.

Many of them committed the crime of unlawful entry. A good number of others may have overstayed a visa or come into America on a visa waiver program. In any case, they are unlawfully present in America. They might sign up for the military. If they do that, they are defrauding the Department of Defense.

We don't recruit people into our military who are unlawfully present in the United States. They have to have a green card, at a minimum; citizenship, better.

Now, one might presume that we are having trouble recruiting people to come into the military, so therefore, we should bring in mercenaries from outside the United States and take the oath to uphold, preserve, protect, and defend our Constitution and go out and defend the liberty of Americans.

That actually happens, but when it happens, it is a violation of the law. If they take that oath of office, illegal aliens into our military have to misrepresent themselves in order to be accepted into the military, so that is fraud. It might well be document fraud.

This bill called the ENLIST Act would reward them for doing so, for defrauding the Department of Defense and, yes, putting on the uniform and, at least in theory, defending America. They take an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. They salute our flag.

They may mean it; they may not mean it. But we know the very act of entering the military was a dishonest act on their part. So why would we accept their oath to have more value—the oath to defend the Constitution, to have more value than their word that they gave when they misrepresented themselves to join the military?

In any case, this ENLIST Act bill rewards people who broke our immigration law by putting them on a path to citizenship, giving them a green card. The only qualifications you need is you are unlawfully in the United States, you enter into the military, you misrepresent yourself to do that because we are not taking them into the military if they are unlawfully present.

Then they have to assert they were in the United States continuously since before December 31, 2011, which happens to be the date that is in the Gang of Eight's bill, and they have to assert that they were brought into this country or came into this country by the time they were 15 years old—they might be in their 30s when they sign up

for the military, who knows—but those have to be the assertions.

Then if they are in the military at the time, then they have to be either honorably discharged or on the path to honorable discharge, and they will then have a path to citizenship.

I think this is a misguided bill. I think it is misguided to think that we need to reward people for breaking the law. It is misguided to believe that Americans will not sign up for our military. We are shrinking our military. We are not expanding our military.

We have high-quality Americans who are lining up to join in all of our branches of service. Yes, I am sure there are recruiters who would like to do a little more, but this is not an expanding Department of Defense budget; this is a shrinking Department of Defense budget. It is not an expanding military; it is a shrinking military.

But that, Mr. Speaker, isn't so much the point as it is what is right and what is wrong, what is justice and what is equity and what is not.

I understand there are people who have sympathy, and they say: this pulls on my heart strings; I think, if they are willing to defend America, I think we ought to give them a path to citizenship.

I understand that, but do the advocates for this ENLIST Act, do they understand that it is a reward for lawbreakers?

They are not just someone who came across the border illegally or someone who overstayed their visa. They are the ones who misrepresented themselves to get into the United States military; we would then trust them with perhaps military secrets and the security of Americans and American installations around the world?

It is not that I don't trust them. I just don't believe that we should be rewarding people who have already proven they have broken the law. If they take the oath to the Constitution and if they are not on a path to citizenship already, if they are unlawfully present in the United States, then they violated the law already, and we are supposed to accept their word for it. I think it is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

I look at some of the press that has come out on this, the tactic and the effort that seems to be that they think they can slip a provision into the NDA bill, the National Defense Authorization bill, a provision in there that would legalize people who illegally entered into the United States military and reward them with a path to citizenship for their trouble?

There are many countries in the world where you are a lot better off in the United States Marine Corps than you would be, say, on the streets of many cities in the countries of the world. That is true.

So this would put out the advertisement, this bill, this ENLIST—badly named ENLIST Act would put out the advertisement, which is sneak into

America, sneak into the military, and that is going to be the most expeditious path to American citizenship and the whole smorgasbord of benefits that comes from American citizenship.

Citizenship must be precious, not handed out like candy in a parade. We don't ride along and throw out citizenship like you do M&Ms or Tootsie Rolls or whatever it is that we are tossing out in our parades.

Citizenship must be precious. The rule of law is precious. It is the center core argument on the immigration issue, the rule of law.

We can't grant amnesty to people because our hearts tell us we have sympathy for individuals. I have sympathy for individuals. In fact, if I am ever declared a liberal, it is because of how I deal with some people individually, because I see something in their eyes and hear something in their voice and see how they carry themselves.

I see something in how they conduct themselves and what they do that convinces me that this is a good person, and I want to invest in them, whether it is my capital, my time, my trust, or recommendations that others do the same. I actually do that on occasion because I have faith in an individual.

But when you set policy—policy for the United States of America because your heart tells you to have sympathy for some people you know, keep in mind there are thousands, hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of people that are impacted by that decision, and you have to say: I trust every one of those people the same way I trust the individual or the individuals that I know that bring the sympathy from my heart.

We aren't charged with having sympathy here in setting foreign policy or setting our national policy because of the sympathies of our heart. We are charged with providing justice and equity, and that is laid out in the Constitution.

To me, it is a clear charge; so when I take an oath to preserve, protect, and defend this Constitution, I mean it. It is the supreme law of the land, the Constitution, and it is the foundation for the rest of the laws.

Congress passed a law that says we are not going to bring people into our military that are unlawfully present in the United States, and when I hear from let's say other Members, in particular an individual Member that says STEVE KING is dead wrong on this issue, Mr. Speaker, I take issue with that.

I am right with the rule of law. I am right with current law. The policy is right because, otherwise, you fill our military up with people who may and likely do and some certainly will have foreign interests.

It is not to the interest of the United States to replace on our ranks, our troops, people who are American citizens or people who are on a path to citizenship, replace them with people who came into the United States illegally.

How poor would we be as a people? How empty our soul as a people if we say: Well, that is another job that Americans won't do? They don't want to put on a uniform and go defend our country, so we will have to reward illegal immigrants, if they will just lie to us, we will let them in the military, and we will give them a path to citizenship.

That is what the ENLIST bill does. It does damage to the rule of law. It is misguided, however good the hearts are of the people who advocate for this.

I think this is an important debate, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't belong on the defense authorization bill. This debate doesn't belong in the Defense Committee, the Armed Services Committee. This debate belongs, if it is going to take place at all, in the committee of jurisdiction, the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, where it ought to have—if it deserves any debate at all, it ought to have witnesses who agree with people like me.

I have seen these hearings come out before, even in our Judiciary Committee, where someone gets the idea that we ought to grant a path to citizenship to several million people who are unlawfully here, and I have seen the committee, even there where there were four witnesses, no questions, another round of four witnesses, now the chairs and the ranking members get to ask questions, 90 minutes after the beginning of the hearing, the first voice of dissent might be heard.

That is not a very good committee, in my opinion; but at least it was in the committee of jurisdiction. I would like to expect that the subcommittee chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee would defend the jurisdiction of his committee and reject the idea that they sneak this bill into the defense authorization bill.

I would like to see that the chairman of the full committee defend the jurisdiction of the committee, as he did so effectively last year, and deny this end round that they are attempting to run this poorly named ENLIST Act around an end run of the Judiciary Committee and to slip it into a must-pass piece of legislation that would come to the floor here under the National Defense Authorization Act.

Our country will be stronger. The security of the country will be at least as strong. The heart of our country will be just as strong. We can still have sympathy for people without turning them all into Americans, and our defense will be stronger because we will have more American citizens step up and actually qualify to get into the service.

Just think, across this country, you go to work, whether you punch a time-clock, whether you are on salary or whatever it might be, you walk into that workplace, and you are there, and let's just presume you are on a production line making an American car.

Let's call it a "Hord." On your right hand is someone working who is unlawfully present in the United States and can't work legally in the United States. On your left hand, there is somebody who fits that same category.

Do the workers standing there realize that there are two good, well-paying jobs that Americans aren't doing, not because they won't, but someone else who is unlawfully in the United States has stepped into their stead and taken that good-paying job, that job that actually pays taxes and contributes to the benefits of people who aren't working?

So if you look on your right and you look on your left and you see somebody working who is unlawfully present, and you say, I like him, I enjoy working with him, he is efficient, probably that is true.

But what is it doing to America? What is it doing to the soul of America? And what is it doing to the rule of law to reward people who break the law while this Congress borrows money every year, 42 cents or so off of every dollar we spend from places like China, Saudi Arabia?

And with the bonds that are out there, about half of our debt to the American people that so far are willing to reinvest in the debt we have, what does that do to America when we are borrowing money to fund the more than 80 different Federal welfare programs that are there?

We have a population of some 316 million Americans. 101.4 million of those 316 million are of working age and simply not in the workforce, and some of the biggest reasons are right there in the list of the 80 different means-tested welfare programs.

So what should we do in this Congress, Mr. Speaker? We should have policies that increase the average individual annual productivity of our people. Each one of us should get out of bed and go forward to contribute to the gross domestic product that day.

□ 1615

That means we come in an hour or 8 hours or 24 hours, if you can. You are contributing to the GDP. That will increase your income. You can pay your share of the taxes. When you make that contribution, you are helping pull the load.

If you are sitting, though, and you are one of those people that has taken this safety net that we offer that I support and turned it into a hammock for yourself and you are riding here when you should be contributing off of somebody else's labor, it is wrong.

We need more Americans going to work. We need a higher percentage of Americans working. There is no work that Americans won't do, including putting on a uniform, going into basic training, being trained up in AIT or wherever you might be assigned to go and step up and defend our country. It has been done with honor. It has been done with dignity. It has been done glo-

riously by Americans since before there was an America, and it needs to be so for the duration of this Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, furthermore, the idea that there are jobs that Americans won't do, I looked at this and I thought: what would be the toughest, dirtiest, nastiest, most dangerous job that Americans are ever asked to do? When I think of this, I think, I bet I know somebody that is an authority on that, and that would be one of the gentlemen in my Conference from Colorado that served in the Marine Corps. The toughest, dirtiest, nastiest, most dangerous job we ask Americans to do is how about rooting terrorists out of a place like Fallujah. What does that pay? How do we get Americans to do that if we can't get Americans to cut meat or pick tomatoes or whatever it might be? How do we get them to do that?

I went back and ran the numbers on that. So a marine in the streets of Fallujah in the line of fire, if you figure him at a 40-hour week, instead of about a 70- or 80- or 90-hour week or more, at a 40-hour week, they were getting paid right at about \$8.09 an hour. If a marine will go into the line of fire for God and country for \$8.09 an hour—and God bless him—I bet we can find some Americans for \$20 an hour to go out there and cut meat and \$20 an hour that might go out and pick lettuce, as the Senator from Arizona used to talk about during his Presidential campaign.

So here is my point, Mr. Speaker. I think this Enlist Act is misguided. I think the press that has spilled out on this has illuminated a deft maneuver to try to circumvent the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. I reject that. I am here defending the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. I think that those who have a heart that tells them, "I want to pass some legislation because I have sympathy for individuals that I know who will make good Americans," I understand that. I have some sympathy for individuals I know that will make good Americans, too, but I am not about—I am not about to usurp and undermine the rule of law, because I didn't run for office telling my constituents my heart is going to overrule my head, my heart is going to overrule human experience and human history and the rule of law and the Constitution. We should know better. We are here to be analytical, to lead and not let the emotions drive us.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I remember a display at the National Archives as I was waiting some years ago to be able to walk up there where the Declaration of Independence is on display. There I see they had the display of the Greeks who had demagogues in their communities. They had the pure democracy. They found out that there were demagogues that could get the masses all ginned up and they would storm off in a direction that was bad for the city-state of Greece. They couldn't control the overheated rhet-

oric of the very effective and persuasive demagogues, so they had a system to blackball them. If three of the members of the city-state—men of voting age in those days—dropped a black ball into the pottery that was the voting one and discarded a white one in the nonvoting one, then they would banish that demagogue from the city-state for 7 years. But that was emotionalism.

Our Founding Fathers understood we didn't want to form a democracy here. We created a constitutional Republic. It is guaranteed in our Constitution. And it has done so because it charges each of us to have a cool head. And I owe my constituents, as everyone here does, my best effort and my best judgment. That includes listening to my constituents, all of them. But it includes also, step back, take a look at it from 10,000 feet; analyze the policy; understand my oath to the Constitution and the supreme law of the land; and act accordingly for the long-term best interest of the United States of America.

This Enlist Act is not in the long-term best interest of the United States of America. It is not in the best interest of America that we circumvent the jurisdiction of the committees. That is not either in the best interest of America. What is in the best interest is we preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and the rule of law and recognize that this immigration debate is driven by emotion on their side. The open borders, amnesty people are driven by emotion, and there are others that stand here and say: We are going to protect the rule of law.

So here is what I would submit, Mr. Speaker. If they are successful in passing a Gang of 8's bill in this House or bringing it to the floor and trying to get it passed, if they are successful in eroding the rule of law with regard to the Enlist Act, if they are successful in getting passed what they call the DREAM Act, that also erodes the rule of law. Anything that rewards people for breaking the law is a continuation of the Amnesty Act that was signed by Ronald Reagan in 1986. We are debating the results of the signature on that bill today.

It was passed this way. It said we are going to legalize a million people who are here illegally because we don't know what to do, and then the promise is we are going to enforce the law hereafter and there will never be another amnesty so long as anyone shall live. That was the promise of the '86 Amnesty Act, and Reagan was honest about it.

So we live with that, but they are pushing on the other side. We never got the enforcement. The 1 million became 3 million plus. The enforcement didn't come, but the implied promise of amnesty exists, and that is what they are pushing on.

If any amnesty is passed now, that perpetuates the promise that there will be another amnesty, which turns up the current end of the huge electromagnet that draws people to come into

America, the promise that they will receive citizenship, a path to citizenship, some kind of amnesty.

We have to restore the rule of law, the respect for the rule of law. If there is a provision that is an amnesty provision that passes, then that promise exists in perpetuity that there will be another one, which means we will not be able to restore the rule of law in this country—at least with regard to immigration—again. I don't know that I can say "ever," but I can say never again would we see the rule of law with regard to immigration within the duration of this Republic, not as long as I shall live or as long as we shall live, not until death do us part. But until the death of this Republic, we will not be able to restore the rule of law, at least with regard to immigration. And the argument goes to the next and the next and the next, Mr. Speaker.

So this is a critically important issue. I am happy to debate this with the colleagues from my Conference in any State where they would like to take this up, be it California, be it Colorado, be it anyplace else around the country.

This debate is one that is important. We need more American people that are aware that our hearts cannot overrule our heads. We cannot allow the rule of law to be torn asunder because we have sympathy for certain people.

Let's have sympathy for Americans first. Let's understand that America can be defended by Americans, and if people want to come and join and defend and help protect America, go get in line the right way. Because the advocates for this kind of legislation will tell you, well, they go to the back of the line. Except this bill isn't the back of the line. It is we create a new line and you are in the front of it. They are not going to allow them to go to the back of the line. They don't really believe it. They will just tell you that.

They will say there is work Americans won't do. Defending America, then how is it that marines will step in the line of fire for \$8.09 an hour? How is it that we have Americans working in every single job and profession that is listed in the Bureau of Labor Statistics Web site?

Americans are doing every work there is to do in this country. They just need to be paid what the work is worth. The wages are being suppressed by elitists who are making millions of dollars off of the cheap labor that is subsidized by the taxpayers who are backfilling and funding these households with the 80 different means tests and welfare programs, and we are borrowing the money from China to do it. So let's have that discussion.

Tell me how we get this budget back to balance. How do you do that while you are rewarding people for not working and you are rewarding people for breaking the law? What kind of country do you want?

I think the advocates for this bill that I so oppose actually want the

same kind of country that I want. I just don't think that they see what they are doing to erode the progress that we need to be making.

I think that when they declare that I am dead wrong, the real result is, if they get their way, there will be more Americans that eventually are actually dead, because there is not a day that goes by in this country that there isn't at least one American citizen that dies at the hands of someone who is unlawfully present in the United States. Whether it is an act of homicide, whether it is an act of willful manslaughter, whether it is an OWI on the streets of America, hardly anybody has gone through the last 10 years and doesn't at least see that show up in their local newspaper, if it doesn't show up in their neighborhood.

So STEVE KING is not dead wrong. Let's keep more Americans alive. If I need to go to those States and have those debates, that is what I will do. But I call upon our committee chairs especially to defend the jurisdiction of our committee. If you are chairing a subcommittee or a committee in the United States House of Representatives that happens to be the Judiciary Committee, the rule of law and the Constitution are essential. I also expect and call upon those who have that special charge to renew their vigorous defense of the rule of law, the jurisdiction of the committee, and the supreme law of the land, the Constitution.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on April 3, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 4152. To provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 7, 2014, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5209. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Farm Storage Facility Loan Program, Security Requirements (RIN: 0560-A119) received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5210. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agri-

culture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Jackfruit, Pineapple, and Starfruit from Malaysia Into the Continental United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0019] (RIN: 0579-AD46) received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5211. A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Office, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC): Revisions in the WIC Food Packages [FNS-2006-0037] (RIN: 0584-AD77) received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5212. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program [Docket ID: ED-2013-OPE-0066] (RIN: 1840-AD13) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5213. A letter from the General Counsel, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, transmitting the Foundation's final rule — Public Access to NEH Records Under the Freedom of Information Act (RIN: 3136-AA32) received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5214. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Lake Meredith National Recreation Area, Bicycling [NPS-LAMR-15022; PPIMLAMRS0,PPMPSPDIZ.YM0000] (RIN: 1024-AE12) received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5215. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Wyoming Regulatory Program [Stats No.: WY-044-FOR; Docket ID: OSM-2013-0001; S1D1SSS08011000SX066A00067F144S180110; S2D2SSS08011000SX066A00033F14XS501520] received March 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5216. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2014-16] received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5217. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Per Capita Distributions of Funds Held in Trust by the Secretary of the Interior [Notice 2014-17] received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1192. A bill to redesignate Mammoth Peak in Yosemite National Park as "Mount Jessie Benton Fremont" (Rept. 113-401). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3366. A bill to